

## National Socialism and Abroad.

Speech to the diplomats and foreign journalists on November 14, 1936.

Nietzsche's saying that the world is ruled by pigeon-footed thoughts is true, I believe, everywhere. Some great man has a hypothesis, a thought in a scientific, political, ideological field; This one form of thought and this one creed continues to have an effect in thousands, in millions and so the greatest upheavals in world history often arise from an initially silent thought. We are convinced that especially in this day and age of great political upheaval, a person who wants to participate inwardly in these events, above all, has to face some demands that were present in the past, but were not thought through and carried out. We believe that a statesman today, more than anyone in the past, must be both a historian and a peoples psychologist. The generous, tolerant upswing of the 18th century, which wanted to lead a "general education of the human race", had overlooked the fact that people were very diverse and could not be "educated" from European points of view and conditions alone.

We saw it in the 18th century that a society that turned away from the medieval religious struggles made the demand for absolute tolerance, that the thoughts of a general education of mankind came to life and that from this one sentence that the external is something external, an attempt was made to bring about a so-called education of all races, from which Herder and Pestalozzi taught. We have 150 years of experience of this single thought in the field of social life as well as in the field of the entire philosophy of the state and, ultimately, most directly in street fights all over the world.

We believe today that this externality, which was previously presented as external, is not a coincidence, but that man, as he walks here on earth in different forms, must also have different forms of life. When a general equality of mankind was proclaimed in the 18th century, it meant making an attempt to force an upswing of thought on all peoples and all races who had shaped their own cultures in other parts of the world from different assumptions, primeval origins and other traditions. But however the individual may answer these questions of the philosophy of humanity today, we are - as far as we are concerned - in a decisive time that places very specific demands on us. We believe that the times when the people and the state were only means of dynastic house powers are over. We believe that an emerging conception and evaluation of history has become alive everywhere among all peoples. We understand by it a deep penetration into the kind from which every people originates, an understanding of the impulses from which the peculiar cultures emerged in the first place, and we understand it to mean an understanding of the real necessities of a people's life in contrast to the perhaps arbitrary attempts of earlier times and maybe also to some of the attempts of our time.

And secondly, I believe that if we want to look at ourselves and others today, we must not overlook a crucial fact: that the most diverse peoples are not in a state of simultaneous development. A people can perhaps have politico-social forms that are conditioned by its industry. Another people - like France - overlooks a democratic tradition that is more than a hundred years old, which was sometimes broken, but repeatedly restored and has already become a tradition for this people. In other peoples this tradition is not yet so deeply rooted. You may only be in the first decade of each other's experiences. Third countries have already left this state behind have completely destroyed themselves and partly through degeneracy, rejected a basis of life in which an entire generation believed (Russia); other states are in the middle of the attempt to grow from the 19th century way of life into a new way of life that we advocate for Germany. With all the optimistic doctrine that we heard in the 19th century, progress and development were synonymous and it was the World War, with everything that followed, that freed us Europeans and other peoples from this displayed optimism, which was a decisive shipwreck had suffered, so that we were all faced with the original problems again.

The second question for the rest of the world, from which no people who work and work on

their own soil can refrain, is the problem of space, which allows certain peculiarities of nature to move, pushes others back again and thus influences the way of life in a decisive way. The island peoples quickly reach their limits. By the sea that girded them they were forced to fight their way inside this area and to form their forms of life. The border was at the same time the possibility of practicing this way of life much more safely and style-consciously than other peoples and states, if the blood-like preconditions existed. And so we see two great peoples forming traditions, which in many cases appeared exemplary for other peoples: Japan and England. Japan, with its tradition going back more than 2000 years, and England, which reached across the seas when it had established itself according to this way of life. And on the other hand, we see this spatial law becoming a reality in America, where a strong wave of conquest passed through the country, to which the vast space gave the opportunity to literally let all individualities have an unrestrained effect. And this infinity of space, the endless design possibilities, has, I believe, preserved the American every feeling of complete carelessness as this space filled up more and more. Today North America faces the fact that it must now claim the same restrictive laws as other peoples.

And finally we see the steppe spreading out in Eastern Europe. This steppe has always been an opponent of clear forms of government. On this steppe lived peoples who resisted these fixed forms of European state conception. And this is how we see the history of this Russian steppe in the fight against European state ideas.

Finally, I believe that Germany is also, in a certain sense, a form of spatial law. Germany is a country open on many sides, surrounded by other peoples; Of course, these have had serious disputes with Germany in the course of history. And because Germany as a space is open on all sides and not girded by the sea, nor can it expand endlessly, the German way of life and the German type of state have to be different than maybe the American or English. To recognize all these phenomena and to understand their legality seems to us today to be the duty of a National Socialist politician. We are not only passionate representatives of a German way of life, but also strive to understand the inner legality of the thinking and acting of other peoples. And we ask that these other nations also come to the idea that what is happening in Germany is not happening to them today, but rather marks the end of 400 years of Prussian-German development. That there is no malice here either, but that the German people have finally struggled to adopt a lifestyle which their space demands, which corresponds to His being and which represents the only possibility of preservation in the middle of Europe.

In the past six months there have been a number of new ones in relation to this new state ideas awakened, in some cases new attacks were raised against National Socialism. We have been particularly accused of one reproach that proves that even with the best will in one's own way of life one is still unable to grasp the necessities of German thought and action. It is not uncommon for us to find in the press that there is actually no difference between the National Socialist form of government and the Communist one. That what is happening in Russia actually reveals its closely related parallel in Germany. It is said that there is no freedom of expression in Germany: it is said that the German people are suffering from a dictatorship and it is declared that religious persecution is taking place in Germany. It is said that the same thing is repeated in Russia and that it can therefore be asserted that the apparently hostile opponents have the same form of state and life. -

We are open enough to declare that, in our opinion, there is no perfect external freedom anywhere in the world. The very fact that a state arises is proof that the individual must limit his individual possibilities. And if one declares that there is no freedom of teaching in Germany, I think I can say that if we look back over the development of the liberal age, one cannot uphold this accusation. It is well known that all those people and thinkers whom we call forerunners and heralds of a new

school of thought have nowhere found a place in German universities. That was true of Lagarde, Nietzsche, and Chamberlain. Severing, however, was awarded an honorary doctorate! No philosophy of history has been admitted that combats the old image of history. One does not have theorists of a new social ethics, but one has only appointed those economic theorists who corresponded to the tenets prevailing at the time. And now I believe it is completely justified if, after such a political victory as National Socialism honestly fought for itself, something new is not suddenly brought up at German universities, but rather an old damage that has been neglected half a century. is made up for. It is necessary that our young scholars, who today feel as successors and at the same time as heralds of a new era, have the right to re-examine the valuation of the past. But the National Socialist side has always emphasized that, if we judge, we are claiming the law of our time, but that we never intend to prevent the freedom of research. Whatever the individual historian on documentsfindet, must be included in the research of our time, without mutilation and without cover-up. But how we have to evaluate these things is our affair and we have a duty to evaluate them as we believe we have to do from the character of our time. I may point out here that the judgment of great statesmen still fluctuates in the judgment of history after three to four hundred years and that such struggles continue for three hundred years in the shadowy world of scholarship. It is for us in Germany. B. always seemed very strange how differently the figure of Oliver Cromwell was viewed. In Germany he is often seen as the founder of a great English world empire, a man who had an influence on the fate of his country like no other man in the island empire. But I have heard a different assessment of this personality from many Englishmen: namely, in examining its development, they rate the great Oliver Cromwell only as an inconvenient interruption in their ongoing history. They recognize what he has done for England outwardly. But you cannot understand that he had an English king beheaded. And I must say that the Englishman is more right to judge this than we are. But if we now judge German figures of the past differently today than before, I am convinced that there is also a German right here to subject these figures to such a test.

And now to the question of the world press. The very fact that the representatives of the world press serve a large publishing house is proof that they too have part of their personal freedom have given up. Because the editor-in-chief in New York or London or the owner of a corporation has a certain idea of the politics of this corporation, and you have probably all had the experience that reports that you may have thought were very good come from the main editorial board<sup>1</sup> have been amended and even rejected. And in the face of this fact, which is nowhere to be denied, the National Socialist movement drew a very truthful conclusion. She said: if it is necessary in the life of a people that the individual has to sacrifice some personal possibilities, e.g. B. in the area of the economy, in our eyes it is better that it is not responsible to a private person, but to the state and the people as a whole. In the transitional period in which we live today, that may seem difficult for some foreigners who are our guests, and for some strangers in Germany who are used to different lifestyles at home, it may seem like a restriction on the freedom of personal expression. But I believe that if a tradition has developed here, then it will mean a matter of course for the coming generation, which now represents a difficulty. Because it always depends on seeing a meaning in all things: whether you have this whole thing in mind or whether you focus only on certain private corporations. We go even further and are convinced that strong private interests in the political field before and after the war often did not help to pacify the peoples, but that what we wish to avoid was brought into the world through some continued private statements namely, the poisoning of the relationship between peoples. Only then, when one tries to avoid this, one serves one's own people and thus the relationship of our people to the other peoples and contributes to bringing the feelings of other peoples to the level that is a prerequisite for the development of the real necessities of life represents.

---

1 25 Gestaltung der Idee

This feeling, I believe, is spreading all over the world today, despite all contradictions, and that does not reduce the task of a journalist or editor, but on the contrary, it increases them. What was previously possible as a private, passionate expression is now drawn into the consciousness of responsibility. The expression of an individual will can thus lead to state policy today and that does not serve to lower the level of a journalist, but rather makes him aware of the responsibility in his country.

And the second point: the dictatorship. I think that by dictatorship one can only understand the situation when a small group or an individual from above imposes his will on a people by force. We do not deny that we made this attempt in 1923. We are of the opinion that this attempt was a necessity at the time compared to the imminent separatist coup d'état by another side. At that time we could not consider what consequences this could have in detail, it was just a necessity. The Führer emphasized more than once that when he overlooks this period today, it was a stroke of fate that the movement did not yet achieve victory because it was perhaps not yet mature internally and the people did not yet have that clarity of goal had before them like today. And so a necessary will has been linked to a fate that has left its defining mark on the German revolution. The National Socialist Revolution has marched under a different law since that time. It has not become a dictatorship from above, but a huge process of popular education from below. The National Socialist revolution was thus the most powerful implementation of a popular will.

25\*

We can claim this above all because the National Socialist movement never made a secret of its intentions for 14 years. It has declared from day one that it regards the 20 or 30 parties not as a representation of the will of the people, but as a damage to the will of the people.

The National Socialist movement also refused from the outset to abuse a religious feeling of the German people for certain claims to rule. There has never been a doubt about what the movement wanted. She has carried her thinking tirelessly through the people and the people have agreed to her in a way that will not be repeated often in the world. We believe we can ask today: is it a mistake if the people only have a political will? Because this one political will still allows all the most diverse temperaments in Germany to have an effect today. Anyone who wants to work and work politically can do so within the political leadership, in the SA, SS, labor service, etc. Every talent is taken care of in Germany today, and there is just as large a playing field for the competitive battle of temperaments as there was in the past. But it is ensured that the temperaments can be tamed. And finally we ask further, are brawls and stone-throwing during political election campaigns the expressions of a popular will, or is this not better represented if we do not have to resort to such means that would lead us back into chaos? Is the idea of a people better represented when it is represented by 50 Parshare or if it is embodied by a movement? Different peoples, different struggles, different traditions, different needs. We do not want to generalize it, but we ask that you understand our situation after 1918 as well. We cannot do otherwise. The forms that were possible and natural in the time of a Biedermeier life will have to differ from the forms of a period of upheaval in world history. What was once beneficial can sometimes become harmful. We reject the attempt at a universalistic theorem. We see in the attempt in the 19th century to impart a universalistic doctrine to all the peoples of the globe, an effort that has its avenging answer in the rising of popular sentiments all over the globe.

We believe that Germany has developed a development here that in some way perhaps is also taking place in many peoples today. Germany was under foreign policy pressure that forced it to go through and solve many questions more quickly than other peoples who did not suffer from this

pressure. If you look at it today, that may be seen as a stroke of fate, but it was the final test of whether Germany broke up or could fight its way through to a new way of life.

We are convinced that every people must be governed according to its essence; Only this enables real respect for the various peoples for one another. We Germans are therefore hard of hearing when it comes to instructions in the governess tone. We also believe that the time is over when one judges, as it were, with a spiritual world police, what should be done in Germany and what should not be done.

And now, thirdly, the area of so-called persecution of religion. It is interesting that these attacks come particularly from a camp that has been involved in this religious war for over 100 years: these attacks very often come from the liberalist side. Unfortunately, it is now being forgotten that in a state like France, for example, this intellectual struggle to break away from the Middle Ages was waged in unbelievably sharp forms for decades, with the result of the separation of state and church. One overlooks the fact that denominational clashes, even street battles, are going on in many countries of the world today as in earlier times. So it's not as if there was an exception in Germany today, on the contrary, if you compare with what force and passion the struggle is being waged elsewhere, one must establish that despite some human incidents, despite the revolution, this struggle in Germany was waged in a form that did not provoke such criticism as some other struggles. It is true that in a time of great upheaval in which we all live, many currents have come to life that go beyond the purely political and that some circles actually advocate religious reform in Germany. We do not want to deny this. But we also want to point out that there are hundreds of sects in Anglo-Saxon countries, for example, who preach their teachings as they want and that the German side has never demanded that these sects be suppressed or destroyed in the interests of ecclesiastical rule, because culture and civilization required it. That is why we also believe that it is not the task of the National Socialist government to suppress this emergence of intellectual currents and religious demands somehow by force. We cannot see that we should recognize Judaization in one direction (celebration of the Sabbath and the like), but not the direction of Europeanization. Should the National Socialist state suppress intellectual struggle with police power? Should the National Socialist movement and the police work to ensure that these new forms of thought and feeling that may arise are simply strangled by our intervention today? Then what we are accused of would happen, namely that we are not tolerant. We have proclaimed the principle of religious freedom of conscience and intend to uphold it. According to this principle, every religious community can freely represent its point of view. And if they only recognize the political structure of the state inwardly and outwardly, no stone will be placed in their way in their activity. The commission that Minister Kerrl received marks the endeavor to enable the old powers to enter the new state over and over again. If in 1918 the two churches in Germany did not clearly oppose Marxist atheism, then the fault is not ours, but theirs. If you have watched the godless propaganda come to life and you have concluded alliances with the actual organizers, it is natural that the German people have not yet forgotten this and find it quite in order, even if it takes a number of years to do so To repent.

The National Socialist movement not only has a deep respect for cultural tradition, but it also knows that it is obliged to respect the beliefs of the past. Anyone who has ever traveled consciously through German districts knows only too well that the first thing you see in a village is the church tower. This is not just an outward symbol, but an inner sign, a recognition of the connectedness through the centuries. He also knows that the Luther Bible is with the farmers in the villages of Northern Germany. In it the names and events of these peasant families are recorded. But if he honors this tradition, he can still say today to the Protestant attacks from abroad that this Bible once did not mean tradition, but the greatest revolution. At that time a whole world acknowledged its fate and drew conclusions from it, the fruits of which hundreds of millions live spiritually today. It was a revolution that shook the whole world so that the ancients believed that the Antichrist had come and the world was going to end. And yet much has emerged from this revolution of the Bible, to which those peoples

profess who not infrequently direct attacks against us today. And if reforms occur here and there in the further development of this world of thought, it is not the Antichrist who is at work again, but a new era that has its worldview and wants to follow its laws. If a religious revolution took place then, it took great courage. Based on this principle, we cannot play the Inquisition today against those who may be striving for reform. When we proclaim this tolerance in all directions, it is expressed that the National Socialist movement is not willing to give up the secular arm for any denominational rule.

But these are the most essential features in which our movement differs from its opposite pole, communism! The National Socialist movement was born out of the people. It emphasizes the value of all national cultural traditions. The communist assumes the destruction of these values. The national-socialist movement strives for the exaltation of all genuine religious feelings without distinction of creeds. Bolshevism, however, strives for the annihilation not only of certain denominations, but of every religious feeling in general. In all these points the sharpest contrast is pronounced, both as regards the form and as regards the content of the world of thought.

An example can - I believe - shed light on the assertion on a world-historical scale. For centuries the peasant has been an object of ridicule, after the oppression of the Reformation the object of persecution of the dynasties, in the liberal period the object of derision and later under Marxist rule he has become an object of total extermination. Today this farmer is again at the center of German life.

I have to think of how Diirer captured this organic history in a picture. It represents a tree of life. Under the roots of this tree of life lies the farmer, then follow citizens and princes, kings and priests, but at the top in the tree tops the farmer sits again. The Marxist movement, which sought to rule a class, wanted to exterminate this peasant by all means. She wanted to destroy his existence. The consequence of this attempt is the fact that a gigantic empire has millions of starvation deaths every winter. So nature takes revenge on the madness of wanting to break its laws. The rule of such laws over the peoples must result in the annihilation of these peoples, and that is why the National Socialist movement is aware that it is actually representing an antipole against degeneration and that it has attempted to learn from the chaos of the past and is aware of it to become the thoughts that led to this catastrophe, and to enable the starting point for a redesign for Germany.

We believe that it is no longer time to proclaim world imperialism of any kind of spirituality, but rather National Socialism hopes that once related peoples systems will be spiritually allied and therefore, rooted in the ground, will be organically opposed to cooperation. And that seems to me to be decisive for judging what is now called indivisible peace, collective peace. In order to establish this peace, clearly separate collectives are required to conclude an agreement with one another. It is not possible to establish a world police point over all the peoples of the earth. This is an attempt from an outdated world of thought that does not promise any success. One will have to get used to the facts of life, which are alive in all peoples, in order to attempt a reconfiguration from this cause. It is clear that similar ideas take up their time in order to be understood in their necessity at all and in order to finally achieve their political realization. We are convinced that no one can deny that the old world of thought led all peoples into a chaos from which the best statesmen with the best will could hardly see a way out.

I hope that when these movements arise and come to life, a working relationship with certain species-related cultural groups will result.

With this in mind, we firmly believe that in order to promote this development, which alone can mean real pacification, and the National Socialist movement also made its contribution.

